



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

as a city already in existence. It has points of contact with the well-known account of the Marduk-Tiamat fight, which it antedates, since this Sumerian document can be safely placed about 2000. B. C. A summary is as follows:

The god Midimmud speaks to his messenger Zubarra about Eridu, the place loved by the god Enki. There the sea meets with no opposition, the large river spreads terror upon the land, and the abyss is covered by great storm clouds. The messenger is directed to bring to Enki the crafty waters of incantation, and his own mighty monsters, as big as rivers. Weapons are prepared, the combat against the sea follows, and, as a result of this, the safety of Eridu is insured. The god then proceeds to create vegetation, birds and fishes. This done, Enki establishes rain for the ocean, overflow for the abyss, winds for the sea. For the river Euphrates he makes a river bed, so as to control its course.

EDWARD CHIERA

University of Pennsylvania

Once more Shāhbāzgarhi uthanam

I have previously tried to show that *Shāhbāzgarhi uthanam* was a true native word, and that the dental *th* was not merely graphical for lingual *th*: see *JAOS* 30. 85, 86 and *IF* 29. 224–226. The publication of Mārkaṇḍeya's *Prākṛtasarvasva* in the *Grantha Pradarśanī*, and Hultsch's paraphrase of the section dealing with Śaurasenī in *ZDMG* 66. 709–726 makes it possible to support this claim with additional evidence. Observe that Mārkaṇḍeya distinctly prescribes Śaurasenī *utthido* (with dental *tth*) but Māhārāṣṭri *utthio* (with lingual *tth*) as correspondents to Sanskrit *utthitas* (for *ud+sthitas*): see III. 15, IX. 40, IX. 137. Hence we may infer a Śaurasenī word *utthānam* (with dental *tth*) which would exactly correspond to *Shāhbāzgarhi uthanam*. That Rājaśekhara does not conform to the rule laid down by Mārkaṇḍeya that in Śaurasenī *sthā* when combined with *ud* becomes *utth-* (with dental *tth*) proves nothing; for years ago both Pischel and Konow proved in detail that he frequently confuses Śaurasenī and Māhārāṣṭri, and Jacobi implied the same thing; more recently (*AJP* 41. 266, 267, 269) I have pointed out a couple more of such blunders. Sir George Grierson in a letter dated November 15th,

1920, calls my attention to Mārkaṇḍeya VI. 4 where Rājaśekhara is rebuked for confusing Śaurasenī and Māhārāṣṭrī.

TRUMAN MICHELSON

Bureau of American Ethnology,
Washington, D. C.

*The locative singular of masculine and neuter i and u stems in
Śaurasenī Prākrit*

Mārkaṇḍeya at IX. 63 gives the rule that *i* and *u* stems in the locative singular have the termination *-mmi*. Now of course this means that a pronominal ending has been extended to nouns. And this is precisely where there is a difficulty: for it should be noted that in the pronouns we have Śaurasenī *-ssim*, Māgadhi *-ssim*, Ardhamāgadhi *-msi*, but Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī and Māhārāṣṭrī *-mmi*. Thus Sanskrit *tasmin*, Śaurasenī *tassim*, Māgadhi *taśsim*, Ardhamāgadhi *tamsi*, Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī and Māhārāṣṭrī *tammi*; Sanskrit *etasmin*, Śaurasenī *edassim*, Māgadhi *edaśsim*, Ardhamāgadhi *eyamsi*, Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī *eyammi*, Māhārāṣṭrī *eammi*; Sanskrit *yasmin*, Śaurasenī *jassim*, Māgadhi *yaśsim*, Ardhamāgadhi *jamsi*, Māhārāṣṭrī *jammo*; Sanskrit *kasmin*, Śaurasenī *kassim*, Māgadhi *kaśsim*, Ardhamāgadhi *kamsi*, Māhārāṣṭrī *cammi*; Sanskrit *anyasmin*, Śaurasenī *anṇassim*, Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī *annammi*; **imasmin*, Śaurasenī *imassim*, Māgadhi *imaśsim*, Ardhamāgadhi *imamsi*, Māhārāṣṭrī *imammi*.¹ Observe also that Mārkaṇḍeya explicitly states (IX. 62) that in Śaurasenī nominal *a* stems have the locative singular in *-e*, which is confirmed by the best texts. Both Pischel and Konow have pointed out that Rājaśekhara violates the dialect by using *-ammi* as well as *-e*, for in Māhārāṣṭrī the locative singular of *a* stems ends in *-ammi* as

¹ I regard the Ardhamāgadhi locatives in *-mmi* (which occur mostly in verse, as can be seen from Pischel's fine collections) as simply Māhārāṣṭrīisms, due to scribal efforts to make the dialect coincide with the dialect mostly used in literature. The locatives in *-mmi* are not easily explained. See Pischel, §313 end. For Māhārāṣṭrīisms in Ardhamāgadhi see also Pischel, §17 near the middle. Ardhamāgadhi *kamhi*, beside *kamsi*, is evidently an error for *cammi*: see Pischel, §366^a near the middle. Amg. *assim* is an anomaly; it is explicable in Ś. Note that Rājaśekhara, in the Karpūramāṇjari, twice uses Śaurasenī *jassim* for Māhārāṣṭrī *jammo*. This is another instance (hitherto unreported) where the author confuses his dialects.